

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	· · ·			
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,285	01/10/2005	Soon-Tae Ahn	SAMH100001000 8520	
22891 7	90 10/19/2006 EXAMINER			
DELIO & PE		IP, SIKYIN		
NEW HAVEN		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1742	
			DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)	<i>k</i>		
Office Action Summary		10/521,28	5	AHN, SOON-TAE			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Sikyin lp		1742			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apor Reply	ppears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturely received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF TH 1.136(a). In no ever ad will apply and will ute, cause the appli	IS COMMUNICATION nt, however, may a reply be tin expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·		
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27.	July 2006.					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Qua	ayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdre Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from con					
Applicat	ion Papers						
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examir The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2005 is/ar Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiration.	re: a) acce ne drawing(s) be ection is require	e held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CF	FR 1.121(d).		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
2) Notice 3) Infor	ot(s) Dee of References Cited (PTO-892) Dee of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) The mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0) Der No(s)/Mail Date	98)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D: 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate)-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/521,285

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In page 6, line 20 ([0036], line 11) of the instant specification, the wording "folding" is an apparent typographical error. The wording "folding" should be read "forging"...

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1742

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over USP 6547890 to Kanisawa et al.

Kanisawa discloses alloy steel composition, hardness (Hv 250 to 700 equals about 793 to 2206 MPa), martensite structure, and spheroidizing (col. 2, lines 19-67 and Table 3). Therefore, when prior art compounds essentially "bracketing" the claimed compounds in structural similarity are all known, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly be motivated to make those claimed compounds in searching for new products in the expectation that compounds similar in structure will have similar properties. In re Gyurik, 596 F.2d 1012, 1018, 201 USPQ 552, 557 (CCPA 1979); See In re May, 574 F.2d 1082, 1094, 197 USPQ 601, 611 (CCPA 1978) and In re Hoch, 57 CCPA 1292, 1296, 428 F.2d 1341, 1344, 166 USPQ 406, 409 (1970). As stated in In re Peterson, 315 F.3d 1325, 1329-30, 65 USPQ2d 1379, 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2003), that "A prima facie case of obviousness typically exists when the ranges of a claimed composition overlap the ranges disclosed in the prior art". Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select any portion of range, including the claimed range, from the broader range disclosed in a prior art reference because the prior art reference finds that the prior art composition in the entire disclosed range has a suitable utility. Also see MPEP § 2131.03 and § 2123.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 1742

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The above rejection relies on the reference(s) for all the teachings expressed in the text(s) of the references and/or one of ordinary skill in the metallurgical art would have reasonably understood or implied from the text(s) of the reference(s). To emphasize certain aspect(s) of the prior art, only specific portion(s) of the text(s) have been pointed out. Each reference as a whole should be reviewed in responding to the rejection, since other sections of the same reference and/or various combination of the cited references may be relied on in future rejection(s) in view of amendment(s).

All recited limitations in the instant claims have been meet by the rejections as set forth above.

Applicant is reminded that when amendment and/or revision is required, applicant should therefore specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.121 and 37 C.F.R. Part §41.37 (c)(1)(v).

Application/Control Number: 10/521,285

Art Unit: 1742

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Ip whose telephone number is (571) 272-1241. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 5:30 A.M. to 2:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Roy V. King, can be reached on (571)-272-1244.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SIKYIN IP PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 1742

S. lp October 16, 2006